

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-20 and 22-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14, 23 and 31 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. Support for the amendments is found in the specification as files at page 9, lines 21-25. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the teleconference of April 4, 2008 wherein merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited documents were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 Under 35

U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully *et al.* (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. *et al.* (US 2003/0191806 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al.* and Osterberg Jr. *et al.* alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest all features set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims are directed towards a computer executable system and method for generation of documents such as meeting preparation reports that compiles information about the meeting including information about the recipients based on social relationships that is helpful in preparing for the meeting. To this end, independent claims 1 recites *generate an event document customized to a user within an organizational chart, the event document presents the event information such that prospective attendee profiles are arranged in a decreasing order of their respective organizational chart distance from the user wherein the organizational chart distance is a shortest path between the user and an attendee within the organizational chart, wherein the organizational chart distance is a sum of the attendee's and the user's organizational chart distance to a manager common to the user and the attendee.* Independent claims 14, 23 and 31 recite similar features. Scully, *et al.* and Osterberg Jr. *et al.* either alone or in combination fail to disclose such novel features.

Scully, *et al.* relates to an electronic calendaring method for assisting a calendar owner to request the system to develop and display a composite calendar comprising entries from a plurality of calendars within a specified time span, which has been selected by criteria entered

interactively into the system by the calendar owner. At the cited portion Scully, *et al.* teaches how a department manager would coordinate the electronic calendars of all the twelve members of his departments to schedule a meeting. As conceded by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Scully *et al.* does not disclose generating an event document customized to a user within an organizational chart, the event document presents the event information such that prospective attendee profiles are arranged in a decreasing order of their respective organizational chart distance from the user.

Osterberg Jr. *et al.* relates to a system and method that provides the capability by which changes in an organization can be automatically reflected in the organization's mailing list and access lists. At the cited portions, Osterberg Jr. *et al.* discloses utilizing the organizational hierarchy information of members comprising positions of the members, identifiers and email addresses to generating a plurality of mailing lists. A mailing list that has the identifier of a first member in it will also have the identifiers of the members who report to the first member. The list also will have identifiers of members lower down on the hierarchy, who report to any of the members in the list. Thus, Osterberg Jr. *et al.* discloses generating a plurality of mailing lists, the lists have identifiers of members such that it includes identifiers of all members lower down on the hierarchy who report to any members present in the list. In contrast, the claimed invention allows for generating an event document customized to a user within an organizational chart, and presenting event information by arranging profiles of prospective attendees in the document relative to their distance to the user in the organizational chart. This sort order is customized to a particular user as it places more familiar recipients (*i.e.*, those likely to be on the same team as the user) on the bottom and more unfamiliar recipients (those likely to be from other teams) on the top. The organizational chart distance between two people is defined to be the shortest path within the org chart. This can be obtained between two people by summing each person's org chart distance to the manager shared by both people as recited in independent claim 14. Thus, Osterberg Jr. *et al.* merely teaches generating a document showing hierarchical chart and is silent regarding ***generating an event document customized to a user within an organizational chart, the event document presents the event information such that prospective attendee profiles are arranged in a decreasing order of their respective organizational chart distance from the user*** as recited by the subject claims let alone teach or suggest defining an organizational chart distance as further detailed in the claims.

By generating a meeting document customized to a user within an organizational chart, the claimed invention leverages the power of social network analysis to help the user quickly prepare for a meeting. For example, the profiles may be formatted based on an organizational chart distance of the attendees from a user who prints the event document hence the attendees who are familiar to the user are printed closer as compared to those who are unfamiliar. This facilitates a user to prepare for a meeting by quickly scanning the event document for unfamiliar attendees. Such novel aspects are not taught or suggested by Scully, *et al* and Osterberg Jr. *et al*.

In view of at least the aforementioned, it can be concluded that Scully, *et al*. and Osterberg Jr *et al*., alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest an identical invention as recited in the subject claims. Hence, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claim 10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully in view of Osterberg Jr. *et al*. and in further view of Holtz *et al*. (US 2003/0001880 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al*., Osterberg Jr *et al*. and Holtz *et al*. either alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claim depends from independent claim 1. As stated *supra*, Scully *et al*. and Osterberg Jr *et al*. fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Holtz *et al*. relates to a system for producing and distributing enhanced media, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claim 10 is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. *et al*. (US 2003/0191806 A1) and in further view of Doss *et al*. (US 2003/0046296 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Scully, *et al*., Osterberg Jr *et al*. and Doss *et al*. either alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature set forth in the subject claims.

The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully *et al.* and Osterberg Jr *et al.* fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Doss relates to providing dynamic contact information to instant messaging (IM) systems and electronic status boards and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency with respect to independent claims 1, 14, 23 and 31. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. *et al.* (US 2003/0191806 A1) and in further view of Estrada *et al.* (US 7,012,627 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

The subject claims depend from independent claims 1, 14 and 31. As stated *supra*, Scully, *et al.* and Osterberg Jr. *et al.* fail to describe all aspects set forth in the subject independent claims. Estrada relates to providing an improved visual display for rooms in collaboration space displayed at a user browser and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Scully, *et al.* and Osterberg Jr. *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 14 and 31. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP658US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731